IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, e	t al.)	
	Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-GKF-PJC
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.)	
	Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE PERTAINING TO ALTERNATE SOURCES OF PHOSPHORUS AND BACTERIA TO THE IRW [Dkt. No. 2436] AND BACTERIAL OR PHOSPHORUS LEVELS IN OTHER WATERSHEDS [Dkt. No. 2411]

EXHIBIT 1
Transcript of July 28, 2009 Hearing

```
1
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                  FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
 3
    STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ex rel,
 4
    W.A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his
 5
    capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
    OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
 6
    et al.
 7
                    Plaintiffs,
                                           CASE NO. 05-CV-329-GKF-PJC
 8
    VS.
 9
    TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,
10
11
                    Defendants.
12
13
14
                        TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                               JULY 28, 2009
15
        BEFORE THE HONORABLE GREGORY K. FRIZZELL, DISTRICT JUDGE
                        MOTION HEARING, VOLUME I
16
17
18
    APPEARANCES:
19
20
    For the Plaintiffs:
                                       MR. DAVID RIGGS
21
                                       MR. DAVID P. PAGE
                                       MR. RICHARD T. GARREN
22
                                       Riggs Abney Neal Turpen
                                       Orbison & Lewis
23
                                       502 W. 6th Street
                                       Tulsa, OK 74119
24
25
```

1 | the above.

Plaintiff did not study the fate and transport characteristics -- or, rather, Dr. Harwood -- of the bacterium or any other bacterium in the IRW.

Given the alternate sources for fecal indicator bacteria and potential alternate sources of the biomarker, the assumption that the correlation is maintained from chicken house to recreational waters is unreliable.

Number three -- or -- and related thereto.

Number three. The theory is not substantiated by traditional fate and transport study. The bacterium -- specifically that the bacterium moves in the environment at the same speed as fecal bacteria in poultry waste. Thus, Dr. Harwood fails to analyze whether the fecal bacteria found in conjunction moved together with the brevibacterium from poultry litter or were from other sources.

Number four. The poultry-specific biomarker is not specific to poultry. Plaintiffs found the same genetic sequences in geese and ducks. They found it in every bird species they tested.

Dr. Harwood does not yet know whether her DNA sequence is carried by other species of brevibacteria or other types of bacteria found in the IRW or how many other species in the IRW carry the bacteria.

Dr. Myoda isolated the biomarker in other materials: